

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

In order to address housing and community development issues that face Indianapolis neighborhoods, the City of Indianapolis receives federal grant funding from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As part of the application process for these grants, the City must produce a Consolidated Plan, a five-year strategic overview of the community's current needs and specific actions for addressing these needs.

At the close of each program year, the City completes a Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) designed to summarize those activities undertaken by the City to meet the objectives set out in the Consolidated Plan. The City's current Consolidated Plan covers the years 2015 through 2019.

Four federal entitlement grants make up the bulk of the funding that supports the activities detailed in this report: the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, the HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program, and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program. The Indianapolis Continuum of Care, is a competitive federal grant that is also used by the City, particularly to combat homelessness. All together, the City received more than \$17 million in HUD funding through these various grant programs.

The activities undertaken in 2015 with CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds address the needs and priorities identified in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. This Plan includes 22 goals to meet the identified needs and priorities. 2015 was the first year of the City's current Consolidated Plan and first year to work towards the five year goals.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	100	28	28.00%			
Affordable Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	33	33.00%	20	33	165.00%
Brownfields/Clean Up	Non-Housing Community Development	Brownfield acres remediated	Acre	2	0	0.00%			
Business expansion & Job Creation	Non-Housing Community Development	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	35	14	40.00%	14	14	100.00%
Community Center Support	Non-Housing Community Development	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	700	4968	709.71%	700	4968	709.71%
DMD Properties	Non-Housing Community Development	Buildings Demolished	Buildings	0	3		30	3	10.00%
DMD Properties	Non-Housing Community Development	Housing Code Enforcement/Foreclosed Property Care	Household Housing Unit	500	0	0.00%			

Down Payment Assistance	Affordable Housing	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	50	40	80.00%	40	40	100.00%
Facade Improvements	Non-Housing Community Development	Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation	Business	10	0	0.00%			
Facade Improvements	Non-Housing Community Development	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	0	0		7	0	0.00%
Homeownership - Construction/Rehabilitation	Affordable Housing	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	15	14	93.33%	3	14	466.67%
Homeownership - Construction/Rehabilitation	Affordable Housing	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	10	2	20.00%	2	2	100.00%
Housing Stability - HOPWA	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HIV/AIDS Housing Operations	Household Housing Unit	250	388	155.20%	50	388	776.00%
Job Training and Placement	Non-Housing Community Development	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	100	544	544.00%	50	544	1,088.00%
Neighborhood Revitalization	Non-Housing Community Development	Other	Other	2	0	0.00%			

CAPER

3

Outreach	Homeless	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	1000	86	8.60%	200	86	43.00%
Owner Occupied Home Repair	Affordable Housing	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	0		0	0	
Owner Occupied Home Repair	Affordable Housing	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	400	134	33.50%	123	134	108.94%
Prevention and Stabilization	Affordable Housing Homeless	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	1000	300	30.00%	200	300	150.00%
Public Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	200	4480	2,240.00 %	4000	4480	112.00%
		Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	0	4		4	4	100.00%
Public Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development								

Public Infrastructure - Neighborhood Improvements	Non-Housing Community Development	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1000	1725	172.50%	1700	1725	101.47%
Rapid Re-Housing	Homeless	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	750	149	19.87%	150	149	99.33%
Shelter Stays	Homeless	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	300	3282	1,094.00 %	60	3282	5,470.00%
Short Term Rent, Utility and Mortgage Assistance	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HIV/AIDS Housing Operations	Household Housing Unit	1000	294	29.40%	200	294	147.00%
Support Services - HOPWA	Non-Homeless Special Needs	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1250	884	70.72%	250	884	353.60%

TBRA	Affordable Housing	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	50	0	0.00%			
TBRA - HOPWA	Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	400	105	26.25%	80	105	131.25%
Technical Assistance	Capacity Building	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	3	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%
Youth Education	Non-Housing Community Development	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	20000	2130	10.65%	2000	2130	106.50%
Youth Employment	Non-Housing Community Development	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	100	0	0.00%	20	0	0.00%

Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

Assess how the jurisdiction’s use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

Please see Attachment 1 for assessment of use of funds and goals.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG
White	4,123	70	185	965
Black or African American	5,508	163	224	2,412
Asian	35	33	2	6
American Indian or American Native	4	0	0	13
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0	0	1
Total	9,671	266	411	3,397
Hispanic	2,374	12	6	187
Not Hispanic	7,297	254	405	3,210

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

Narrative

Together, CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA grants provided assistance to 13,745. Of the total number of people assisted, 8,307 or 60 percent were Black or African American; 5,343 or 38.9 percent were White; 76 or .5 percent were Asian; 17 people were American Indian or American Native; and 2 people were Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. In addition, 2,579 or 18.8 percent of those assisted were Hispanic.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	Federal	33,600,000	16,194,433
HOME	Federal	12,800,000	3,754,371
HOPWA	Federal	3,760,000	903,597
ESG	Federal	2,760,000	740,780

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

Narrative

The resources made available in the chart above are the resources for the remaining time of the Consolidated Plan, 2016-2019. These are projections based on the amount of funds we received in 2014 when the Consolidate Plan was written. The CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds are awarded to the City of Indianapolis based on a federal formula and the federal budget that is passed by the United States Congress.

The annual amount anticipated of CDBG for 2015 was \$8,262,393 and the City expended \$16,194,433. The majority of the excess expenditure was from funds that carried over from prior years. In addition to the carry-over funds, some of these expenditures were from projects that started in 2014, but didn't get completed until 2015.

The annual amount anticipated of HOME for 2015 was \$2,941,333 and the City expended \$3,754,371. This is a difference of \$813,038. These expenses came from projects that were awarded in previous years, but didn't get completed until 2015.

The annual amount anticipated of HOPWA for 2015 was \$950,492 and the City expended \$903,597 and the annual amount anticipated of ESG for 2015 was \$749,167 and the City expended \$740,780. Both of these amounts are small and immaterial. It is likely that the final claims for 2015 HOPWA and ESG programs were paid in 2016.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
East	8	20	Multi-family Rental, Economic Development, Homeowner Repair, Public Facilities/Improvements

East	16	20	Multi-family Rental, Economic Development, Homeowner Repair, Public Facilities/Improvements
Northeast	2	18	Economic Development, Homeowner Repair
Northeast	4	18	Economic Development, Homeowner Repair
North	21	24	Multi-family Rental, Economic Development, Homeownership, Homeowner Repair
North	34	24	Multi-family Rental, Economic Development, Homeownership, Homeowner Repair
Northwest	0	4	Multi-family Rental
Northwest	4	4	Multi-family Rental
South	2	17	Public Facility, Homeowner Repair
South	3	17	Public Facility, Homeowner Repair
West	2	13	Multi-family Rental, Homeowner Repair, Homeownership

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

The target areas in the chart above are all designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs). NRSA designations can obtain substantial benefits through regulatory flexibilities that would otherwise require waiver approval from the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning & Development. These benefits include increased flexibility with regard to the use of CDBG funds for housing and economic development activities that revitalize a neighborhood, exemptions from the public service cap for activities carried out by Community-Based Development Organizations, and other record-keeping requirements.

Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

In total, the CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA programs were able to leverage \$14,179,364 in 2015. This leverage came from other federal sources, local grants, private funds and philanthropic resources. The CDBG program was able to leverage \$10,512,247; ESG leveraged \$998,014; and HOPWA leveraged \$2,687,076.

The HOME program requires a 25 percent match. The City did not report any new match for 2015 because \$6,879,232 in excess match was carried over from previous years. The match obligation for 2015 was \$228,191. The excess match from previous years far exceeds the 2015 match obligation. The City is carrying over excess match of more than \$6.6 million for 2016.

In 2015, the City exceeded the 25 percent match requirement for the ESG program by matching \$998,041. This match came from the following sources: other non-ESG HUD funds, other federal funds, state government, local government, private funds and other sources. A more detailed description of the ESG match is described in CR-75, 11f of this report.

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	6,879,232
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	0
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	6,879,232
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	228,191
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	6,651,041

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year							
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Match							0

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period			
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$
0	0	0	0
Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$			0

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	320,000	0	0	40,000	0	280,000
Number	7	0	0	1	0	6
Sub-Contracts						
Number	65	0	0	1	0	64
Dollar Amount	199,079	0	0	4,586	0	194,493
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	280,000	0	280,000			
Number	7	0	7			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	58	1	57			
Dollar Amount	182,045	5,600	176,445			

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0	0			
Businesses Displaced		0	0			
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0	0			
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0	0			
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	610	468
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	500	1,566
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	90	109
Total	1,200	2,143

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	90	105
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	23	42
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	102	169
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	215	316

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

The City did not meet the goal for providing homeless affordable units primarily because there is a lack of units available to our homeless population. The Continuum of Care is working to find ways to increase resources and the number of units available for homeless individuals and families. In addition, a new development, Penn Place Apartments, opened on December 30, 2015. This development created 38 new permanent supportive housing units for homeless individuals. These units are not included in the 468 units above, because they were not funded with any of the entitlement programs. However, the City did support 20 of these units with Continuum of Care funding. The ESG program will continue to coordinate with the Indianapolis Continuum of Care to address this issue.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

2015 was the first year of the City's current Consolidated Plan and the City was able to meet all of the affordable housing goals except one. At this time, the City will continue to work towards the five year goal for providing affordable housing to the homeless and evaluate progress on an annual basis. The City increased the amount of funds available for Rapid Rehousing in the 2016 Action Plan which should increase the number of homeless to be provided affordable housing. If it becomes apparent through the City's evaluation process that a Consolidated Plan amendment is necessary, the HUD process for amendments will be followed.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	60	48
Low-income	46	40
Moderate-income	62	28
Total	168	116

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

In 2015, the City of Indianapolis assisted 284 people with CDBG and HOME funds where information on income by family size was required to determine eligibility. Of the 284 people assisted, 38 percent earned incomes below 30 percent of the area median family income. This population faces many challenges due to the amount of income earned, often times experience a housing cost burden and many of them meet the special needs definition. Thirty percent of those assisted earned incomes between 31 percent and 50 percent of the area median family income. Finally, 32 percent of those assisted earned incomes between 51 percent and 80 percent of the area median family income.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)

Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Often, the first encounter with homeless individuals and families is through street outreach and at shelters. Service providers are able to tailor programming to move people from the street and into shelters or other housing by street outreach and identifying the needs of these neighbors. In 2015, the City funded one organization to provide street outreach. These organizations assisted 331 people by providing shelter housing assistance and access to mainstream benefits and healthcare.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

In 2015, the City of Indianapolis invested \$320,830 of ESG in Indianapolis homeless shelters that include 391 beds and served 3,017 people. During their stay, the clients' needs were assessed by shelter staff to determine what support services were necessary to work towards permanent housing such as: mainstream resources, job training, child care, legal assistance, food, etc.

The Indianapolis ESG program and the Indianapolis Continuum of Care are working to reduce the average shelter stay by 10 percent each year between 2015 and 2019. The Continuum of Care Performance Measurement Work Group is calculating shelter stay information and will be ready to report progress in 2016.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The City of Indianapolis awarded \$214,000 to seven organizations to provide homelessness prevention activities. This funding helped 306 people with rent and utility assistance. These clients also received intensive case management to help them work towards self-sufficiency.

The Blueprint to End Homelessness 2.0 outlines several strategies to prevent homelessness or as the

Blueprint calls, High Impact Prevention. High impact prevention focuses on efforts within the spheres of the CoC work, connecting providers for needs that are further away from the urban core, and increase assistance to keep individuals and families in their homes. The Continuum of Care and the City of Indianapolis will work to ensure people have adequate resources, provide immediate crisis support to stabilize individual and family housing and develop new strategies for re-entry and medical referrals. The CoC, through Blueprint 2.0 have outlined the following High Impact Prevention goals:

- Increase access to assistance that keeps individuals and families in their homes
- Increase access to intentional community supports Educate individuals about their role/responsibility in a path to self-sufficiency Increase access to legal assistance Explore “early warning” systems for service in advance of eviction or foreclosure
- Work to ensure individuals and families have adequate financial resources
- Provide access to financial assistance Improve financial literacy, budgeting skills and access to resources Identify funders to assist with outstanding bills
- Work to ensure individuals are sufficiently employed
- Help individuals get and stay employed through education, life skills training, mentoring/coaching and transportation assistance Identify potential barriers to employment and work with clients to hurdle those barriers Work with businesses to: Increase opportunity and wages Increase employee retention Extend case management post-housing, post-employment Leverage successful employment programs Link public policy understanding of employment to advocacy related to wages, transportation and child care
- Provide immediate crisis support to stabilize housing for individuals and families in imminent risk of homelessness or a return to homelessness
- Coordinate prevention efforts and prevent return to homelessness by creating a “bridge” from direct service to neighborhood supports
- Coordinate initiatives across providers, community centers, townships, etc. Effectively bridge from wrap-around services to longer term-community center programs and related supports
- Develop re-entry programs for offenders, veterans, patients and youth coming out of foster care
- Partner with corrections, the Veterans Administration, mental health providers, hospitals and children services
- Increase the number and effectiveness of mental health referrals and access to appropriate medical care
- Partner with a wide range of providers and institutions

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

Through the hard work and coordination of many organizations participating in the Continuum of Care, clients are provided supportive services and resources to assist them in transitioning their lives to independent living and permanent housing. Case managers work diligently to provide everything from job training assistance to addictions counseling to healthcare providers. These services along with rental assistance and in some cases utility assistance help the client transition to independent living and permanent housing.

In 2015, 1,350 homeless clients moved from shelter or transitional housing to permanent housing. In addition, 149 clients received rapid rehousing assistance that places a priority on moving a family or individual experiencing homelessness into permanent housing as quickly as possible. Rapid rehousing programs help families and individuals living on the streets or in emergency shelters solve the practical and immediate challenges to obtaining permanent housing while reducing the amount of time they experience homelessness.

CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

In an effort to preserve affording housing in the Indianapolis area, the Indianapolis Housing Agency (IHA) has committed to converting all of their public housing units through the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD). IHA received approval for 12 of the properties in 2015. IHA met with City staff in 2015 to explain the RAD program and the plans for the conversion. They will start the conversion in 2016 along with getting approval on the remaining 4 properties.

In addition, IHA's non-profit development arm, Insight Development, completed the Millikan on Mass Ave development in 2015. This development consists of the rehabilitation and upgrade of 246 public housing units in the Barton Tower and 126 public housing units in the Barton Annex. This development also included the new construction of 125 new units, of which, 61 units are affordable and will be leased to households with income at or below 60 percent of the area median income. The City provided support for this development throughout the project including \$1.7 million of Tax Increment Financing on the later phases of the development.

The City and IHA will continue to work together and collaborate on issues related to public housing and other affordable housing in 2016.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

IHA encourages public housing residents to get involved in their resident councils by providing leadership, funds and training for residents that want to create or maintain their resident councils. IHA staff meets with residents monthly, provides newsletters and updates a web page to keep the residents informed throughout the RAD conversion process. IHA encourages residents to participate in the Family Self Sufficiency program which assists residents to establish goals of homeownership and put aside funds for escrow.

An IHA/Insight development on the city's south side, Red Maple Grove, includes a homeownership component. In 2015, eight newly constructed homes were sold. Of the eight new homebuyers, one was a public housing resident.

All Section 8 voucher holders are provided information about homeownership opportunities at Red Maple Grove through the IHA Homeownership Program. In addition, IHA caseworkers educate residents about homeownership opportunities and encourage them to consider the homeownership program.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

The Indianapolis Housing Agency is not a troubled PHA; therefore, this question is not applicable.

CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

In 2015, the City of Indianapolis completed the Indy ReZone project. This project spanned over a period of five years and included a great deal of citizen involvement and input. Indy ReZone is a comprehensive update to the City of Indianapolis' zoning ordinances. This effort was a complete overhauling of the 1970 Marion County zoning code.

Zoning code impacts public land and building construction, including public parking, sidewalks, vacant and occupied buildings, and landscaping. The newly adopted ReZone ordinance encourages a variety of housing options closer to public transit, reduces required parking spots for new shops and restaurants (increasing potential revenue), requires bicycle facilities and parking at new developments, and significantly incentivizes public transit stops and shelters.

Many of the affordable housing options in Indianapolis are multifamily rental developments. Through ReZone Indy, more than half of the development regulations required by zoning were removed making it easier to build multifamily rental units. In addition, ReZone Indy created mixed-use districts that encourage transit oriented development with access to housing and services. The new zoning ordinance offers other opportunities for affordable housing by making secondary dwelling units a personal right and allowing for live/work units.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

Youth and un/underemployed individuals represent two of the most underserved populations in Indianapolis. CDBG public service funding was used to target these groups through services, case management and job training in 2015. The City funded a number of organizations to administer youth and employment programs. In addition, HOPWA and ESG funds were used to assist two other underserved needs: persons living with HIV/AIDS and persons who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless.

In 2015 the City awarded \$438,480 of CDBG funds to Employ Indy to provide job training and placement activities to very low income individuals. Employ Indy utilizes an aggressive marketing campaign to inform any potential clients of their services. Employ Indy enrolled 544 people in their employment program in 2015. Eighty-four percent of those enrolled earned less than 30 percent of the area median

income at the time of enrollment. One hundred ninety (190) people received job training and 150 people were placed in jobs. Of the 150 people placed in jobs, 42 percent of them were able to retain their jobs for 60 days and 36 percent were able to retain their jobs for 90 days.

Indianapolis partners with a number of youth serving organizations to provide programs such as: before after school care, youth employment, youth education and summer enrichment activities/programs. In 2015, the City awarded \$385,904 of CDBG funds to these organizations. Together, youth serving organizations were able to serve 2,130 young people in Indianapolis.

The HOPWA Grant was awarded to two organizations: The Damien Center and IU Bloomington. These organizations provided housing services to 479 people that are HIV/AIDS positive. In 2015, 185 people received tenant-based rental assistance and 294 people received short-term utility, rent or mortgage assistance. In addition, 1,310 people received support services such as case management, alcohol and drug abuse services, life skills, legal services and employment assistance and training.

The ESG Grant provided \$258,200 of funding for homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing and assisted 384 people. This type of activity includes rent assistance, utility assistance and client-based case management. In addition, \$320,830 was provided to homeless shelters to assist 3,017 people with shelter stays and support services.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The City of Indianapolis follows the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rules for addressing lead based paint hazards when applying CDBG, HOME and other grant funding. Effective September 15, 2000, Federal regulations require that lead hazard evaluation and reduction activities be carried out for all CDBG and HOME funded projects receiving housing assistance that were constructed before January 1, 1978. The requirements for rehabilitation correspond to three (3) approaches to lead hazard evaluation and reduction. Large rehabilitation projects must meet more stringent requirements than smaller ones. The three approaches are:

1. Do no harm. Perform the rehabilitation in a way that does not create lead hazard.
2. Identify and control lead hazards. Identify lead-based paint hazards and use a range of methods to address the hazards.
3. Identify and remediate lead hazards. Identify lead-based paint hazards and remove them permanently.

In 2015, the City of Indianapolis utilized three sources of funding to address lead paint hazards in the community, CDBG, HOME, and a Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant. The Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant was awarded November, 2012 and consisted of \$3,000,000 to be administered over three years. 2015 was the final year.

The lead grant was able to remediate 62 units of lead contamination, making units lead safe for low

income families with young children, or pregnant women. Out of the 62 units, the City was able to determine that 35 children and pregnant women were able to live in a residence that was lead safe. The City was also able to perform lead remediation for 12 families at or below 80% AMI, and 7 families at or below 50% AMI.

The Federal regulations regarding lead based paint hazards and the requirements for housing renovation have been incorporated as part of the City of Indianapolis Grants Management Policies and Procedures Manual. The manual outlines, in detail, the process for alerting residents of any lead hazards and the requirement for control and abatement of the hazards. A copy of the policies and procedures manual is provided to the grant recipient/housing provider at the time of contract.

The Department of Metropolitan Development has focused the grants towards the development of healthy housing by identifying high-risk populations, conducting lead inspections and risk assessments, and mitigating lead hazards through interim and abatement controls.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The City entered into an agreement with EmployIndy, which in turn granted funds to four (4) organizations for job training activities. These activities allowed for 544 low and moderate-income individuals to be enrolled in job placement programs. One hundred 141 received some kind of recognized credential. In addition, 150 individuals were placed in jobs. This partnership has helped ensure that our cities most vulnerable are receiving the best job training possible and employment opportunities to help improve their quality of life.

The City approved economic development funding four organizations totaling nearly \$2.6. These projects will create 64 full time employment equivalent jobs. These jobs are on pace to be filled over the two years. The City is committed to creating additional economic development opportunities primarily within the neighborhood revitalization strategy area.

Additionally, the City funded 11 organizations to provide home owner repairs. These organizations assisted 136 low-income homeowners. Of the 136 homeowners that receive repair assistance, 63 percent had incomes below 50 percent of the area median family income. The types of repairs provided address health and safety concerns such as: roof, windows, HVAC, foundation, etc. Without this type of assistance, many of these homeowners would be living in homes that don't meet decent, safe and sanitary conditions.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The City of Indianapolis, Community Development staff has worked to improve processes, learn new federal requirements, increase staff capacity and develop staff and project sponsor knowledge of

federal and local requirements. These activities assist with compliance and effective implementation of federal grant programs.

In 2015, the HOME grant staff received technical assistance from HUD to improve the city's compliance with the long-term affordability requirements. Through this process, the HOME grant staff created a tracking mechanism for the rental properties in the city's HOME portfolio. This effort created a tiered approach for inspections by categorizing 67 projects with a total of 1,420 HOME-assisted units. The first tier (2015) included 17 projects with a total of 232 units. Inspections and tenant income certifications were completed for 14 of the 17 projects. We are continuing to work with the property owners to complete the remaining three projects in 2016.

In 2015, Community Development hired a new employee to complete Environmental Release of Funds and Environmental Assessments in accordance with HUD requirements. This new employee is a former Department of Metropolitan Development Planner that brings environmental, mapping, and planning experience. She was able to complete the 2016 Environmental Release of Funds for projects that were included in the draft 2016 Action Plan in the 2015 calendar year. This increased the staff of the Division of Community Development which increased the overall capacity of the grant staff.

In 2015, Community Development staff began using an on-line webinar system to conduct trainings and disseminate city policies and regulatory information. The first training using this webinar system was titled "How to Submit a Claim" which included twenty participants. For future reference, this webinar has been uploaded to You-Tube and the DMD website. Due to the success of this first webinar, Community Development will be providing monthly webinar trainings throughout 2016 on topics such as: Lead-based Paint, Davis Bacon, HOME Long-Term Compliance, etc.

In 2015, the federal government combined a number of Office of Management and Budget Circulars into one new federal regulation, 2 CFR 200. City staff received training on this new regulation from the City's audit firm, BKD. During this training, staff had the opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification. In addition, HUD released guidance on the implementation of 2 CFR 200 in 2015. Community Development staff has updated forms, policies and procedures, and boiler plate contracts to comply with this new regulation.

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

Penn Place is a strong example of coordination between public and private housing. Penn Place is a multi-family rental development that was completed in 2015 and will provide permanent supportive housing to Indianapolis homeless individuals. This project was developed by a private developer, BWI Investments, and consists of 38 units. The Continuum of Care Program will provide rental assistance for 20 units and the remaining 18 units are public housing units. Midtown Mental Health will provide

support services for the tenants living at Penn Place Apartments.

In addition, the City and Insight Development have collaborated on the development of other affordable housing options to lessen the burden on public housing. Insight Development completed the Millikan on Mass Ave development in 2015. This development consisted of the rehabilitation and upgrade of 246 public housing units in the Barton Tower and 126 public housing units in the Barton Annex. This development also included the new construction of 125 new units, of which, 61 units are affordable and will be leased to households with income at or below 60 percent of the area median income.

The City also funds service providers working in collaboration with public housing to create a better resident experience and lifestyle. The assistance to summer youth programming offers low income families with activities and safe places for resident's children during summers. EmployIndy promotes services within Indianapolis public housing facilities to improve economic standing of residents. Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Partnership provides home ownership opportunities for residents seeking to eventually become independent and own their own home.

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)

The draft Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice document identifies four impediments, action items for each impediment, and timeframe to complete action items.

This draft document also called for a task force to be formed to study the possibility of creating visitability standards in Indianapolis and including income as a protected class. The first meeting of the task force met on March 17, 2015 and included 22 community stakeholders. The task force identified two work groups: 1) Visitability Work Group and 2) Income as a Protected Class Work Group.

The Visitability Work Group researched other cities that had adopted visitability standards, researched building costs associated with these standards, analyzed demographic data, and made recommendations. Visitability standards were included in the draft version of Rezone Indy, the City's update to zoning codes. However, due to community opposition, these standards were removed from the zoning ordinance prior to approval. The City will continue to work towards encouraging visitability and/or accessibility in development projects receiving federal funds.

The Income Work Group reviewed proposed local ordinances and consulted with the Fair Housing Center of Central Indiana and the Indianapolis Apartment Association to determine the impacts of this concept. While this work group was meeting, the Indiana State Legislature passed a state law that nullified this issue. The City is determined to work with IHA and the Fair Housing Center to identify why housing choice vouchers appear to be clustered in Indianapolis. Beginning in 2016, the City will use CDBG funding to pay for fair housing trainings for city employees, property managers and housing

developers.

In 2015, the City of Indianapolis sponsored the Annual Fair Housing Conference using CDBG funds. This conference featured eight workshop options for attendees. Some of these options included: Ensuring Fair Housing Choice for Those with Disabilities, Fair Housing and Indiana Housing Protections for Survivors of Domestic Violence, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Through Analyses of Impediments, etc.

In addition, the Indianapolis Office of Equal Opportunity responds to complaints issued by the public regarding: discrimination in employment, housing, education, and public accommodation on the basis of a person's race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, ancestry, age, disability, or United States military service veteran status, or retaliation. The Office of Equal Opportunity fairly investigates claims of discrimination within Marion County, Indiana to determine whether there is reasonable cause to believe discrimination occurred. If the investigation finds that an entity has violated the law, action is initiated to stop the discrimination.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

The City monitors all aspects of its funded programs and projects that impact compliance. Monitoring project sponsors for compliance falls into four general areas:

1. **Program monitoring** assesses the overall performance and operation of the program and helps the City assess if its programs and activities are carried out effectively and in compliance with HUD rules.
2. **Administrative and financial monitoring** assesses the fiscal and administrative management of the HUD funds.
3. **Project monitoring** assesses compliance with requirements related to specific activities and projects (such as specific homebuyer or economic development projects).
4. **Long-term monitoring*** assesses compliance with long-term HOME requirements that apply to HOME-assisted rental and homeownership housing after project completion. *HOME only.

A Risk Analysis has been developed for grant programs and assists City staff in determining which project sponsors are “at risk” and require monitoring. Risk is determined using the following criteria for each program:

1. **Financial:** examines the extent to which the grantee accounts for and manages financial resources in accordance with approved financial management standards, and the amount of potential monetary exposure.
2. **Physical*:** The Physical section of the Risk Assessment is the extent to which HUD-Funded physical assets are developed and maintained and operated according to established standards.
*HOME only
3. **Management:** The Management subcategory measures the extent to which the program participates has the capacity to carry out HUD programs according to the established requirements.
4. **Compliance:** The compliance section of the Risk Assessment examines past compliance problems from the Project Sponsors.

After “at risk” subrecipients have been determined, each project sponsor’s files are reviewed:

1. Gather project financials and progress reports
2. Schedule monitoring visit
3. Inform project sponsors of what the City is looking for during monitoring

The City will either conduct a **desk monitoring** or **on-site monitoring**:

Desk Monitoring: Desk reviews are conducted at the City's office. The desk review involves reviewing reports and other documentation that are submitted to the City from a variety of sources, as a means to track performance or compliance problems.

Onsite Monitoring: On-site monitoring enables the City to conduct a more in-depth level of review than the desk review. Onsite monitoring involves a visit to the funded entity's office to review documents and source information, observe actual program operations, and discuss programs and projects with the staff carrying them out. Onsite monitoring is recommended when the risk analysis or desk review suggests that there may be problems, or if a long period of time has elapsed since the last visit.

The Department of Metropolitan Development has partnered with the Office of Minority & Women Business Development and project sponsors to establish goals for minority and women business participation with City projects. Participation numbers are reported monthly to the Office of Minority & Women Business Development to determine if goals are being met and if contractors and subcontractors are certified minority or women owned businesses.

Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)

Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.

Cooperation and participation from the community is a critical component to accomplishing the city's community development goals. As part of the Citizen Participation Plan, citizens are encouraged to comment on the outcomes of the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER).

The City of Indianapolis made this document available by placing a public notice in the Indianapolis Star (Indy Star) and the Indianapolis Business Journal (IBJ). This notice was published March 4, 2016, one week prior to the draft CAPER being available for public review and comment on March 14, 2016. Comments will be accepted until March 28, 2016.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

With the pursuit of a rapid transit line through the city and revamped focus on alternative transportation options for residents, transit oriented development has become a key strategy and objective when evaluating potential projects. Additional consideration is being given to projects that compliment a planned rapid transit line. Projects are encouraged to work with the bike share program and Blue Indy to offer transportation alternatives. Some of the greatest barriers have been the ability to have site control on potential properties prior to the allocation of funding or a solid project scope. These projects are not ready for federal funds, yet project sponsors wish to maintain control of properties that could compliment transit oriented development. The creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund is one such tool being created to address these concerns.

The City is attempting to pursue more loans with their funds to create program income that can assist in maintaining higher annual funding amounts during the midst of increasing reductions in annual allocations. The City is requesting more proposals to include loan terms for projects that can support debt. The City will work to develop underwriting criteria and provide direction to potential projects to ensure project success, but also provide for returns. The staff will be exploring outside underwriting assistance to negotiate and construct feasible loan terms for projects.

The City will be creating training opportunities for partners to improve project sponsor performance on project management and monitoring. The programs will have stricter deadlines and requirements to meet with the addition of these trainings. The City is using webinars and additional technical assistance for project sponsors. The goal will be to host a webinar at least once a month to address some aspect of grant management and best practices. These will then be made available online as training videos in instances of staff turnover learning a new system. The trainings provide a consistent message and method expected to be carried out.

The City has worked to improve communications between project sponsor staff and City staff. City staff provides biweekly updates on contract status, expiration dates, and remaining project funds. We alert project sponsors of expiration of contracts and important deadlines to ensure they will meet project completion in a timely manner. These updates provide clear communications recognizing the responsibilities of the project sponsor in carrying out the grant. Grant disbursements are more likely to be timely as a result, because the majority of claims are submitted on time.

Projects that fall behind are now easier to target. City staff meets with the project sponsors of these projects to identify issues and offer any support to ensure a successful project completion. Quarterly

reports are formatted to provide the project sponsor and the City with an easy to understand document for viewing project status and benchmarks.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?	No
--	----

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

The following HOME-assisted projects were due for on-site inspections in 2015:

- Amistad Apartments
- Equity Fund 8
- Franklin School Apartments
- Hawthorne Center for Working Families
- Jefferson Apartments
- Maple Creek Apartments/Michigan Apartments
- Mapleton Double
- MB Infill III
- MLK CDC Singles
- New Life Transitional Housing
- Northampton Village Apartments
- SEND Rentals
- The Gramses
- Universal Housing
- Villages of Mill Crossing Phase 3
- Walnut Ridge Apartments
- Stratford Place
- Lincoln Apartments

There were 18 properties that were scheduled to be inspected in 2015. Fifteen of the 18 properties received an on-site physical inspection of the units and an on-site review of tenant files. Inspections and a file review of tenant files were not conducted on Equity Fund 8, MB Infill III, and MLK CDC Singles. The Department of Metropolitan Development made multiple attempts to request recertification materials, on-site physical inspections, and on-site file review of tenant files with no response from the property owners/management companies. The Department of Metropolitan Development has consulted with the City's Attorney to determine possible sanctions that could be given to the non-compliant property owners/management companies. The non-compliant properties have all received Findings and have been added to the 2016 list of properties to be inspected. The Department of Metropolitan Development issued one finding out of the 15 properties inspect. The Finding was given to Michigan

Apartments due to lack of verification of tenant income. The property management company provided the necessary paperwork and the finding was resolved.

**Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units.
92.351(b)**

All property owners/management companies are required to complete and return an Affirmative Marketing Form at the time of the annual tenant income recertification. Property owners/management companies must provide a synopsis of the efforts taken to affirmatively market HOME-assisted units, efforts taken to inform persons not otherwise likely to apply for housing without special outreach and describe how affirmative marketing efforts are assessed. Property owners/management companies must also identify the media used to advertise the availability of HOME units. The Affirmative Marketing Form is reviewed by the Department of Metropolitan Development and kept in the property owners/management file.

Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

There were no amount and use of program income for projects in 2015.

**Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing).
91.320(j)**

The Department of Metropolitan Development has allocated funding in the HOME budget specifically intended for the use of low-income tax credits. The Department of Metropolitan Development works with developers that request the use of HOME funds to ensure potential developments contain affordable units.

CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	200	294
Tenant-based rental assistance	80	105
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	50	0

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

The City exceeded all of its HOPWA goals except one, "units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds". In 2015, the City did not allocate any HOPWA funding towards this goal, because it was not needed by the two HOPWA provider's clients. In 2016, the City will evaluate the need for this service with HOPWA providers and clients to determine if this goal will be included in future Annual Action Plans. This goal was not included in the 2016 Action Plan and there was no HOPWA funding allocated toward this goal.

CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	INDIANAPOLIS
Organizational DUNS Number	067890848
EIN/TIN Number	356001063
Identify the Field Office	INDIANAPOLIS
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Indianapolis CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mrs
First Name	JENNIFER
Middle Name	J
Last Name	FULTS
Suffix	0
Title	Administrator

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	200 East Washington Street, Suite 2042
Street Address 2	0
City	Indianapolis
State	IN
ZIP Code	-
Phone Number	3173275899
Extension	0
Fax Number	3173275908
Email Address	jennifer.fults@indy.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms
First Name	Courtney
Last Name	Purnell
Suffix	0
Title	Human Services Grant Manager
Phone Number	3173275806
Extension	0
Email Address	courtney.purnell@indy.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 01/01/2015
Program Year End Date 12/31/2015

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Horizon House
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46202, 3952
DUNS Number: 858555576
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 65000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Catholic Charities Indianaolis
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46222, 3714
DUNS Number: 177391807
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Faith-Based Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 40000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Indianapolis Interfaith Hospitality Network
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46244, 1367
DUNS Number: 932690449
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 17000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Southeast Community Services

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46203, 1151

DUNS Number: 966904604

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 81200

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46221, 1540

DUNS Number: 121577175

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 60000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Coburn Place Safe Haven

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46205, 2798

DUNS Number: 141823893

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 43830

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: HealthNet, Inc.

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46202, 1411

DUNS Number: 150659126

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 40000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Julian Center
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46202, 1305
DUNS Number: 132409731
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 50000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Coalition For Homelessness Intervention and Prevention
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46208, 4383
DUNS Number: 612746177
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 30000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Gennesaret Free Clinic
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46204, 1414
DUNS Number: 960195949
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 40000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Outreach, Inc.
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46201, 2404
DUNS Number: 145007840
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 20000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Damien Center
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46201, 3808
DUNS Number: 624497269
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 45000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Recycle Force
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46202, 2778
DUNS Number: 142751911
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 31500

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Dayspring Center
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46202, 2606
DUNS Number: 624100335
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 50000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Horizon House
City: Indianapolis
State: IN
Zip Code: 46202, 3952
DUNS Number: 858555576
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 60000

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Salvation Army

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46204, 1536

DUNS Number: 125472113

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 37500

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Outreach, Inc.

City: Indianapolis

State: IN

Zip Code: 46201, 3322

DUNS Number: 145007840

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 17500

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 15 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 16 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 17 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 18 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 19 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	0
Female	0
Transgender	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 20 - Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	0
18-24	0
25 and over	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 21 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households				
Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	0	0	0	0
Victims of Domestic Violence	0	0	0	0
Elderly	0	0	0	0
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless	0	0	0	0
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	0	0	0	0
Chronic Substance Abuse	0	0	0	0
Other Disability	0	0	0	0
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	0	0	0	0

Table 22 – Special Population Served

CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	391
Total Number of bed-nights provided	375
Capacity Utilization	95.91%

Table 23 – Shelter Capacity

11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

At this time, the City does not have data needed to assess the goals created by the Continuum of Care that were previously mentioned in the Consolidated plan. The Continuum of Care Planning and Investment Committee is currently assessing the Blueprint to End Homelessness and identifying revised goals. The City of Indianapolis' ESG program will incorporate these goals developed by the CoC once the new goals have been established. It is anticipated that the City will be able to report on these newly revised goals in the 2016 CAPER.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	455,966	204,980	280,429
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	455,966	204,980	280,429

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	0

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	14,457	0	0
Operations	202,125	275,896	332,000
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	216,582	275,896	332,000

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS	70,709	45,150	30,000
Administration	54,912	45,658	38,919
Street Outreach	0	0	59,358

Table 27 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
2,051,201	798,169	571,684	681,348

Table 28 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	90,324	159,095	102,339
Other Federal Funds	520,346	560,518	26,235
State Government	0	0	20,000
Local Government	56,328	11,967	21,000
Private Funds	491,612	277,258	380,815
Other	617,200	455,549	447,652
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	1,775,810	1,464,387	998,041

Table 29 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
6,289,439	2,573,979	2,036,071	1,679,389

Table 30 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities

ATTACHMENT 1

The first goal in the Consolidated Plan is to develop 200 affordable rental housing units through new construction (100 units) and rehabilitation (100 units) by 2019. The City projected that 20 units would be completed through rehabilitation in 2015 and 33 units were actually completed. The City exceeded its annual goal for rehabilitation of affordable rental units. While no new construction of affordable rental units were projected for 2015, the City completed 28 newly constructed rental units. In this first year of the Consolidated Plan, the city achieved 30.5 percent (61 units) of the five year to develop 200 affordable rental units.

The second goal is to remediate 2 acres of brownfields in Indianapolis over a five year period. Since the Consolidated Plan was written in 2014, the City has identified other funding sources to assess and remediate brownfield sites. These funding sources come from the federal Environmental Protection Agency, State resources and local brownfield funds. Since other sources have been identified to address this priority, federal HUD funds will be used to work towards the other goals and priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan. The City will amend the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan to remove this goal.

The next goal is business expansion and job creation. The Consolidated Plan goal is to create 35 new jobs by 2019 and the annual goal was to create 14 new jobs. The City met the 14 new jobs goal in 2015 and is on track to exceed the five year goal. The city funded several economic development projects that will create new jobs over the next four years. Irvington Coal Factory will create 15 new jobs in 2016. The City also funded Pia Café (Englewood CDC), Sustainable Local Foods Indiana, Circle City Industrial Complex (Riley Area Development), and the Build Fund (King Park Area Development) in 2015. These projects are all within a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) and will create new jobs 18 months from the expiration of the contract or completion of the eligible activities.

The City far exceeded the next goal to assist low-moderate income persons through supporting neighborhood community centers. In 2015, Indianapolis community centers provided youth and employment programs in low-income neighborhoods and were able to assist 4,968 people. The City will consult with the community centers and will likely increase this goal to be more consistent with the actual number of persons they are serving.

The DMD properties goal included two indicators: buildings demolished and code enforcement. The 2015 Action Plan called for the demolition of 30 buildings that met the slum and blight national objective. Three blighted and unsafe buildings were demolished in 2015. The City received Blight Elimination funding from the State that will be used to demolish future unsafe structures on sites the will be redeveloped. While this new funding source is available, the City will not allocate future CDBG funds for this activity. The City will amend the Consolidated Plan to remove this goal.

Another Consolidated Plan goal was to provide down payment assistance to low/moderate-income homebuyers. The five year goal was to assist 50 homebuyers and the City has met 80 percent of that goal. The annual goal was to assist 40 homebuyers which the City met.

The next goal was to make façade improvements to businesses located in low income neighborhoods. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) received two CDBG awards in 2014 and 2015 for the improvement of facades within the community. Due to internal staff turnover, the program was unable to reach the goals they had initially anticipated. City staff is working with LISC staff to extend existing awards and provide additional guidance, as needed, to achieve the goals set. As of March of 2016, 3 facades have been completed using CDBG funds. Based on these completions and the number of projects in the process, the City anticipates exceeding the five year goal of 10 businesses assisted.

The next goal is to create new affordable homeownership opportunities by constructing new homes. The City met 93 percent of the five year goal to build 15 new units and sell them to people with incomes below 80 percent of the median family income. Fourteen new homes were built and sold to eligible buyers in 2015, far exceeding the annual goal of 3 units. The units that were completed were from funds that were committed in previous years and the units were finished in 2015. The City will consider amending this goal to increase the number of units.

The City is on track to meet the goal of creating new homeownership opportunities through rehabilitation. The five year goal is to rehabilitate 10 units and sell them to income eligible homebuyers. In 2015, the City completed 2 units meeting the annual goal and achieving 20% of the five year goal.

Three goals: Housing Stability for HOPWA clients, employment training for low/moderate income persons and shelter stays for homeless clients will likely be amended to increase the number of people to be assisted. The City underestimated these numbers which caused the actual number of people served to far exceed the five-year and annual goals.

The Consolidated Plan called for the revitalization of two neighborhoods over the five year period. Revitalization efforts have begun in three “great place” neighborhoods: the near east side, the north area and the near westside. The City will continue to track the progress of these neighborhoods and report the outcomes in the 2019 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.

The City invested ESG funding in homeless outreach in 2015; however, the City is behind in working towards the five-year goal to assist 1,000 people. In 2015, only 43 percent of the annual goal was achieved. ESG funding has shifted away from outreach and moved to homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing. The City will consult with ESG providers to amend this goal in the Consolidated Plan.

Another goal in the Consolidated Plan is to provide repairs to homes owned and occupied by persons earning less than 80% of the area median family income. The five year goal is to complete 400 homes and the annual goal was to complete 123 homes. In 2015, the City completed 134 units, exceeding the annual goal by 11 units. This City is on track to complete the five year goal of 400 units.

The City exceeded the annual goal for Homelessness Prevention and is on track to achieve the five year goal. In 2015, ESG funds were used to assist 300 people with homelessness prevention activities. The City has achieved 30 percent of the five year goal to assist 1,000 people.

The next goal is Public Facilities. This goal has two strategies with two indicators: 1) Public Facility or Infrastructure with persons served and 2) Overnight/Emergency/Transitional Shelter with number of beds. The City completed two public facility projects (public park and public trail) near the University of Indianapolis that served a low-income area of 4,480 people. The other public facility is a transitional housing facility that provides respite care for homeless women leaving a hospital. This transitional housing facility includes four beds. This goal has been completed for the five-year period.

The City completed two Public Infrastructure-Neighborhood Improvement projects in 2015. One of the projects was the reconstruction of a pedestrian bridge on the city's southeast side and the other project was the construction of the first phase of a new trail, Pogues Run. Both of these projects were managed by the City Department of Public works. The goal has been completed for the five-year period.

The Consolidated Plan identified the following three HOPWA goals that are on target: Short Term Rent, Utility and Mortgage assistance; Support Services-HOPWA; and Tenant-based Rental Assistance-HOPWA. In 2015, 294 clients received short term rent, utility or mortgage assistance exceeding the annual goal by 94 people and achieving 29 percent of the five year goal. Eight hundred Eighty-Four people received support services with HOPWA funding which is 70 percent of the five year goal. Finally, 105 people receive tenant based rental assistance with HOPWA funding. This exceeded the annual goal and achieved 26 percent of the five year goal.

The Consolidated Plan also included a tenant-based rental assistance goal for the HOME program. This program will specifically assist persons with disabilities. The goal is to provide rent assistance to 50 people by 2019. The City will enter into a contract with AccessAbility in 2016 to begin implementation of this program. It is anticipated that the City will achieve the five year goal.

In 2015, the City awarded CDBG funds to the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) to provide technical assistance to three non-profits to build capacity of the organizations to complete three development projects. Due to staff turnover at LISC, they were not able to complete this project in 2015. The City has extended this contract and anticipates this work to be completed in the next 12 months.

The final two goals in the Consolidated Plan are Youth Education and Youth Employment. The City awarded CDBG funds to organizations that carried out youth programs in 2015. The City did not track the number of youth receiving educational programs separate from the youth involved in employment programs. The annual goal for these activities combined was 2,020 and 2,130 youth were actually assisted. The Consolidated Plan will be amended to combine these goals into one youth services goal and the five year goal will be reduced. City Staff believes that the five year goal of 20,000 youth to be served was an error in the Consolidated Plan and it should have been 10,000 youth.

The City was able to achieve most of the annual goals and is on track to achieve many of the five year Consolidated Plan goals. By completing this assessment, the City was able to identify some goals that need to be amended in accordance with the City's Citizen Participation Plan and will work to complete the amendments in 2016.

Q5. HMIS DQ & Participation

5a. HMIS or Comparable

Database Data Quality Q5a

Data Element	Client Doesn't Know or Client Refused	Data not collected
First name	0	0
Last name	0	0
SSN	271	13
Date of Birth	2	2
Race	19	2
Ethnicity	16	2
Gender	0	0
Veteran Status	7	6
Disabling condition	3	1
Residence Prior to Entry	12	4
Relationship to Head of Household	0	23
Destination	431	115
Client location for project entry	0	41
Length of Time on Street, in ES or SH	0	223

Q6. Persons Served**6a. Report Validations****Table** Q6a

a. Total number of persons served	3533
b. Number of adults (age 18 or over)	1868
c. Number of children (under age 18)	1663
d. Number of persons with unknown age	2
e. Total number of leavers	3072
f. Total number of adult leavers	1607
g. Total number of stayers	461
h. Total number of adult stayers	265
i. Number of veterans	47
j. Number of chronically homeless persons	16
k. Number of adult heads of household	1724
l. Number of child heads of household	2
m. Number of unaccompanied youth under age 25	125
n. Number of parenting youth under age 25 with children	420

6b. Number of Persons Served**Served** Q6b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Adults	1867	968	898	0	1
b. Children	1662	0	1661	0	0
c. Don't know / refused	2	0	1	0	1
d. Information missing	2	0	0	0	2
e. Total	3533	969	2560	0	4

Combined Report

Q7a. Households Served

7a. Number of Households Served Q7a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
Total Households	1758	953	803	0	2

7b. Point-in-Time Count of Households on the Last Wednesday Q7b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
January	263	148	114	0	1
April	232	118	113	0	1
July	259	135	123	0	1
October	245	132	112	0	1

Q9. Contacts and Engagements

9a. Number of Persons Contacted Q9a

	Total	a. First contact was at a place not meant for human habitation	b. First contact was at a non-residential service setting	c. First contact was at a residential service setting	d. First contact place was missing
a1. Contacted once?	0	0	0	0	0
a2. Contacted 2-5 times?	0	0	0	0	0
a3. Contacted 6-9 times?	0	0	0	0	0
a4. Contacted 10 or more times?	0	0	0	0	0
az. Total persons contacted	0	0	0	0	0

9b. Number of Persons

Engaged

Q9b

	Total	a. First contact was at a place not meant for human habitation	b. First contact was at a non-residential service setting	c. First contact was at a residential service setting	d. First contact place was missing
b1. Engaged after 1 contact?	0	0	0	0	0
b2. Engaged after 2-5 contacts?	0	0	0	0	0
b3. Engaged after 6-9 contacts?	0	0	0	0	0
b4. Engaged after 10 or more contacts?	0	0	0	0	0
bz. Total persons engaged	0	0	0	0	0
c. Rate of engagement (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Q10. Gender

10a. Gender of Adults

Q10a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. Unknown household type
a. Male	415	302	112	1
b. Female	1447	660	786	1
c. Transgender male to female	10	10	0	0
d. Transgender female to male	0	0	0	0
e. Other	0	0	0	0
f. Don't know / refused	0	0	0	0
g. Information missing	0	0	0	0
h. Subtotal	1868	968	898	2

10b. Gender of Children Q10b

	Total	a. With children and adults	b. With only children	c. Unknown household type
a. Male	817	815	0	1
b. Female	844	844	0	0
c. Transgender male to female	0	0	0	0
d. Transgender female to male	2	2	0	0
e. Other	0	0	0	0
f. Don't know / refused	0	0	0	0
g. Information missing	0	0	0	0
h. Subtotal	1663	1661	0	1

10c. Gender of Persons
Missing Age Information Q10c

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Male	1	0	0	0	1
b. Female	1	0	1	0	0
c. Transgender male to female	0	0	0	0	0
d. Transgender female to male	0	0	0	0	0
e. Other	0	0	0	0	0
f. Don't know / refused	0	0	0	0	0
g. Information missing	0	0	0	0	0
h. Subtotal	2	0	1	0	1

Combined Report

10d. Gender by Age

Ranges

Q10d

	Total	a. Under age 18	b. Age 18-24	c. Age 25-61	d. Age 62 and over	e. Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused	f. Data not collected
a. Male	1547	209	202	1101	34	1	0
b. Female	1986	1430	104	448	3	1	0
c. Transgender male to female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Transgender female to male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f. Don't know / refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
g. Information missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
h. Total	3533	1639	306	1548	37	2	0

Q11. Age

Q11

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Under 5	714	0	714	0	0
b. 5 - 12	699	0	699	0	1
c. 13 - 17	239	0	238	0	0
d. 18 - 24	293	123	170	0	0
e. 25 - 34	657	202	455	0	0
f. 35 - 44	458	235	221	0	2
g. 45 - 54	310	254	56	0	0
h. 55 - 61	123	117	6	0	0
i. 62+	37	37	0	0	0
j. Don't know / refused	2	0	1	0	1
k. Information missing	0	0	0	0	0
l. Total	3533	969	2560	0	4

Q12. Race & Ethnicity**12a. Race**

Q12a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. White	941	387	552	0	2
b. Black or African-American	2373	510	1863	0	0
c. Asian	11	9	2	0	0
d. American Indian or Alaska Native	16	7	9	0	0
e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	3	0	0	0
f. Multiple races	168	47	121	0	0
g. Don't know / refused	19	7	12	0	0
h. Information missing	2	0	0	0	2
i. Total	3533	970	2559	0	4

12b. Ethnicity

Q12b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	3327	934	2394	0	1
b. Hispanic/Latino	188	29	159	0	0
c. Don't know / refused	16	6	9	0	1
d. Information missing	2	0	0	0	2
e. Total	3533	969	2562	0	4

Q13. Physical and Mental Health Conditions**13a1. Physical and
Mental Health****Conditions at Entry**

Q13a1

	Total persons	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Mental illness	578	315	262	0	1
b. Alcohol abuse	94	80	13	0	1
c. Drug abuse	181	88	93	0	0
d. Both alcohol and drug abuse	51	42	9	0	0
e. Chronic health condition	373	214	159	0	0
f. HIV/AIDS and related diseases	43	36	7	0	0
g. Developmental disability	123	55	68	0	0
h. Physical disability	189	132	56	0	1

**13b1. Physical and
Mental Health****Conditions of Leavers**

Q13b1

	Total persons	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Mental illness	478	224	253	0	1
b. Alcohol abuse	72	56	15	0	1
c. Drug abuse	160	77	83	0	0
d. Both alcohol and drug abuse	35	26	9	0	0
e. Chronic health condition	289	155	134	0	0
f. HIV/AIDS and related diseases	40	33	7	0	0
g. Developmental disability	104	43	61	0	0
h. Physical disability	153	98	54	0	1

**13c1. Physical and
Mental Health
Conditions of Stayers**

Q13c1

	Total persons	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Mental illness	27	12	15	0	0
b. Alcohol abuse	4	3	1	0	0
c. Drug abuse	3	2	1	0	0
d. Both alcohol and drug abuse	2	2	0	0	0
e. Chronic health condition	16	9	7	0	0
f. HIV/AIDS and related diseases	0	0	0	0	0
g. Developmental disability	6	4	2	0	0
h. Physical disability	13	11	2	0	0

Q14. Domestic Violence

**14a. Persons with
Domestic Violence
History**

Q14a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Yes	797	371	426	0	0
b. No	947	483	461	0	3
c. Don't know / refused	22	14	8	0	0
d. Information missing	104	101	3	0	0
e. Total	1870	969	898	0	3

**14b. Persons Fleeing
Domestic Violence**

Q14b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Yes	591	310	281	0	0
b. No	40	13	27	0	0
c. Don't know / refused	3	1	2	0	0
d. Information missing	163	47	116	0	0
e. Total	797	371	426	0	0

**Q15. Residence Prior to
Project Entry**

Q15

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Homeless situations					
a1. Emergency shelter	240	115	125	0	0
a2. Transitional housing for homeless persons	26	23	3	0	0
a3. Place not meant for human habitation	156	115	40	0	1
a4. Safe haven	7	6	1	0	0
az. Total	429	259	169	0	1
b. Institutional settings					
b1. Psychiatric facility	14	13	1	0	0
b2. Substance abuse or detox center	18	18	0	0	0
b3. Hospital (non- psychiatric)	62	59	3	0	0
b4. Jail, prison or juvenile detention	20	18	2	0	0
b5. Foster care home or foster care group home	0	0	0	0	0
b6. Long-term care facility or nursing home	1	1	0	0	0
b7. Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria	2	2	0	0	0
bz. Total	117	111	6	0	0

Combined Report

c. Other locations					
c01. PH for homeless persons	2	1	1	0	0
c02. Owned by client, no subsidy	61	36	25	0	0
c03. Owned by client, with subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
c04. Rental by client, no subsidy	268	120	146	0	2
c05. Rental by client, with VASH subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
c06. Rental by client, with GPD TIP subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
c07. Rental by client, with other subsidy	33	14	19	0	0
c08. Hotel or motel paid by client	172	64	108	0	0
c09. Staying or living with friend(s)	365	150	215	0	0
c10. Staying or living with family	402	164	238	0	0
c11. Other	48	39	9	0	0
c12. Don't know / refused	12	9	3	0	0
c13. Information missing	3	2	1	0	0
cz. Total	1366	599	765	0	2
d. Total	1912	969	940	0	3

Q20. Non-Cash Benefits

20a. Type of Non-Cash

Benefit Sources

Q20a

	At entry	At Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers	At Exit for Leavers
a. Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program	307	53	288
b. WIC	30	8	33
c. TANF Child Care services	8	5	13
d. TANF transportation services	0	0	3
e. Other TANF-funded services	1	1	8
f. Other source	9	3	15

Q21. Health Insurance Q21

	At entry	At Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers	At Exit for Leavers
a. MEDICAID health insurance	924	23	395
b. MEDICARE health insurance	90	3	73
c. State Children's Health Insurance	116	15	129
d. VA Medical Services	5	0	5
e. Employer-provided health insurance	24	1	22
f. Health insurance through COBRA	0	0	0
g. Private pay health insurance	38	2	28
h. State Health Insurance for Adults	210	4	88
i. No health insurance	896	39	506
j. Client doesn't know/Client refused	80	3	49
k. Data not collected	417	29	376
l. Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment	0	336	0
m. 1 source of health insurance	1345	40	666
n. More than 1 source of health insurance	37	4	39

Q22. Length of Participation**Q22a2. Length of
Participation—ESG
projects**

Q22a2

	Total	Leavers	Stayers
a. 0 to 7 days	679	652	27
b. 8 to 14 days	390	348	42
c. 15 to 21 days	290	248	42
d. 22 to 30 days	317	284	33
e. 31 to 60 days	821	721	100
f. 61 to 90 days	337	296	37
g. 91 to 180 days	442	343	99
h. 181 to 365 days	138	97	41
i. 366 to 730 days (1-2 yrs.)	93	53	40
j. 731 to 1095 days (2-3 yrs.)	0	0	0
k. 1096 to 1460 days (3-4 yrs.)	0	0	0
l. 1461 to 1825 days (4-5 yrs.)	0	0	0
m. More than 1825 days (>5 yrs.)	0	0	0
n. Information missing	0	0	0
o. Total	3507	3046	461

**Q22c. RRH Length of
Time between Project
Entry Date and
Residential Move-in
Date**

Q22c

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. 0-7 days	0	0	0	0	0
b. 8-14 days	0	0	0	0	0
c. 15-21 days	0	0	0	0	0
d. 22 to 30 days	0	0	0	0	0
e. 31 to 60 days	13	13	0	0	0
f. 61 to 180 days	8	8	0	0	0
g. 181 to 365 days	10	10	0	0	0
h. 366 to 730 days (1-2 yrs.)	7	7	0	0	0
i. Data Not Collected	40	15	25	0	0
j. Total	78	53	25	0	0

**Q22d. Length of
Participation by
Household type**

Q22d

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. 0 to 7 days	679	179	500	0	0
b. 8 to 14 days	390	100	290	0	0
c. 15 to 21 days	290	97	193	0	0
d. 22 to 30 days	326	88	238	0	0
e. 31 to 60 days	829	237	592	0	0
f. 61 to 90 days	346	79	267	0	0
g. 91 to 180 days	426	115	311	0	0
h. 181 to 365 days	128	44	83	0	1
i. 366 to 730 days (1-2 yrs.)	93	18	75	0	0
j. 731 to 1095 days (2-3 yrs.)	0	0	0	0	0
k. 1096 to 1460 days (3-4 yrs.)	0	0	0	0	0
l. 1461 to 1825 days (4-5 yrs.)	0	0	0	0	0
m. More than 1825 days (>5 yrs.)	0	0	0	0	0
n. Information missing	0	0	0	0	0
o. Total	3507	957	2549	0	1

Q23. Exit Destination –
More than 90 Days Q23

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Permanent destinations					
a01. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH	0	0	0	0	0
a02. Owned by client, no ongoing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a03. Owned by client, with ongoing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a04. Rental by client, no ongoing subsidy	37	4	33	0	0
a05. Rental by client, VASH subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a06. Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a07. Rental by client, other ongoing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a08. Permanent housing for homeless persons	0	0	0	0	0
a09. Staying or living with family, permanent tenure	0	0	0	0	0
a10. Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure	0	0	0	0	0
az. Total	37	4	33	0	0

Combined Report

b. Temporary destinations					
b1. Emergency shelter	0	0	0	0	0
b2. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA TH	0	0	0	0	0
b3. Transitional housing for homeless persons	0	0	0	0	0
b4. Staying with family, temporary tenure	0	0	0	0	0
b5. Staying with friends, temporary tenure	0	0	0	0	0
b6. Place not meant for human habitation	0	0	0	0	0
b7. Safe Haven	0	0	0	0	0
b8. Hotel or motel paid by client	0	0	0	0	0
bz. Total	0	0	0	0	0
c. Institutional settings					
c1. Foster care home or group foster care home	0	0	0	0	0
c2. Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	0	0	0	0	0
c3. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	0	0	0	0	0
c4. Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility	0	0	0	0	0
c5. Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility	0	0	0	0	0
c6. Long term care facility or nursing home	0	0	0	0	0
cz. Total	0	0	0	0	0

Combined Report

d. Other destinations					
d1. Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria	0	0	0	0	0
d2. Deceased	0	0	0	0	0
d3. Other	1	1	0	0	0
d4. Don't know / refused	0	0	0	0	0
d5. Information missing	0	0	0	0	0
dz. Total	1	1	0	0	0
e. Total	38	5	33	0	0

Q23a. Exit

Destination—All
persons

Q23a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Permanent destinations					
a01. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH	0	0	0	0	0
a02. Owned by client, no ongoing subsidy	68	18	50	0	0
a03. Owned by client, with ongoing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a04. Rental by client, no ongoing subsidy	835	213	622	0	0
a05. Rental by client, VASH subsidy	3	3	0	0	0
a06. Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy	1	1	0	0	0
a07. Rental by client, other ongoing subsidy	105	21	84	0	0
a08. Permanent housing for homeless persons	80	6	74	0	0
a09. Staying or living with family, permanent tenure	198	48	150	0	0
a10. Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure	60	29	31	0	0
az. Total	1350	339	1011	0	0

Combined Report

b. Temporary destinations					
b1. Emergency shelter	201	63	138	0	0
b2. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA TH	0	0	0	0	0
b3. Transitional housing for homeless persons	82	16	66	0	0
b4. Staying with family, temporary tenure	313	62	251	0	0
b5. Staying with friends, temporary tenure	186	39	147	0	0
b6. Place not meant for human habitation	8	7	1	0	0
b7. Safe Haven	2	2	0	0	0
b8. Hotel or motel paid by client	88	15	73	0	0
bz. Total	880	204	676	0	0
c. Institutional settings					
c1. Foster care home or group foster care home	5	1	4	0	0
c2. Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	3	3	0	0	0
c3. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	9	9	0	0	0
c4. Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility	19	12	7	0	0
c5. Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility	8	7	1	0	0
c6. Long term care facility or nursing home	3	2	1	0	0
cz. Total	47	34	13	0	0

Combined Report

d. Other destinations					
d1. Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria	0	0	0	0	0
d2. Deceased	2	2	0	0	0
d3. Other	32	13	19	0	0
d4. Don't know / refused	431	84	344	0	3
d5. Information missing	210	121	89	0	0
dz. Total	672	220	449	0	3
e. Total	2952	797	2149	0	3

**Q23b. Homeless
Prevention Housing
Assessment at Exit** Q23b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Able to maintain the housing they had at project entry--Without a subsidy	139	94	45	0	0
b. Able to maintain the housing they had at project entry--With the subsidy they had at project entry	1	1	0	0	0
c. Able to maintain the housing they had at project entry--With an on-going subsidy acquired since project entry	8	0	8	0	0
d. Able to maintain the housing they had at project entry--Only with financial assistance other than a subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
e. Moved to new housing unit--With on-going subsidy	3	3	0	0	0
f. Moved to new housing unit--Without an on-going subsidy	17	7	10	0	0
g. Moved in with family/friends on a temporary basis	12	12	0	0	0
h. Moved in with family/friends on a permanent basis	3	3	0	0	0
i. Moved to a transitional or temporary housing facility or program	0	0	0	0	0
j. Client became homeless-moving to a shelter or other place unfit for human habitation	2	2	0	0	0
k. Client went to jail/prison	5	5	0	0	0

Combined Report

l. Client died	0	0	0	0	0
m. Client doesn't know/Client refused	9	2	7	0	0
n. Data not collected (no exit interview completed)	27	24	3	0	0
o. Total	226	153	73	0	0

**Q24. Exit Destination –
90 Days or Less**

Q24

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Permanent destinations					
a01. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH	0	0	0	0	0
a02. Owned by client, no ongoing subsidy	1	0	0	0	0
a03. Owned by client, with ongoing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a04. Rental by client, no ongoing subsidy	162	2	19	0	0
a05. Rental by client, VASH subsidy	1	0	0	0	0
a06. Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy	0	0	0	0	0
a07. Rental by client, other ongoing subsidy	6	0	0	0	0
a08. Permanent housing for homeless persons	0	0	0	0	0
a09. Staying or living with family, permanent tenure	22	0	0	0	0
a10. Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure	1	0	0	0	0
az. Total	193	2	19	0	0

Combined Report

b. Temporary destinations					
b1. Emergency shelter	19	0	0	0	0
b2. Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA TH	0	0	0	0	0
b3. Transitional housing for homeless persons	5	0	0	0	0
b4. Staying with family, temporary tenure	58	0	0	0	0
b5. Staying with friends, temporary tenure	42	0	0	0	0
b6. Place not meant for human habitation	1	0	0	0	0
b7. Safe Haven	0	0	0	0	0
b8. Hotel or motel paid by client	13	0	0	0	0
bz. Total	138	0	0	0	0
c. Institutional settings					
c1. Foster care home or group foster care home	0	0	0	0	0
c2. Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility	0	0	0	0	0
c3. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center	1	0	0	0	0
c4. Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility	4	0	0	0	0
c5. Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility	0	0	0	0	0
c6. Long term care facility or nursing home	0	0	0	0	0
cz. Total	5	0	0	0	0

Combined Report

d. Other destinations					
d1. Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria	0	0	0	0	0
d2. Deceased	0	0	0	0	0
d3. Other	0	0	0	0	0
d4. Don't know / refused	64	0	0	0	0
d5. Information missing	39	0	0	0	0
dz. Total	103	0	0	0	0
e. Total	439	2	19	0	0

25a. Number of Veterans

Q25a

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. Unknown household type
a. Chronically homeless veteran	3	3	0	0
b. Non-chronically homeless veteran	44	31	13	0
c. Not a veteran	1808	925	882	1
d. Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused	7	6	1	0
e. Data Not Collected	6	4	1	1
f. Total	1868	969	897	2

Q26b. Number of Chronically Homeless Persons by Household

Q26b

	Total	a. Without children	b. With children and adults	c. With only children	d. Unknown household type
a. Chronically homeless	214	98	116	0	0
b. Not chronically homeless	3305	1223	2078	0	4
c. Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused	0	0	0	0	0
d. Data Not Collected	0	0	0	0	0
e. Total	3519	1306	2174	0	4

CAPER 2015 CDBG/HOME/ESG

